CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 2 CHATHAM-SQUARE, BY P. PRICE, AT $2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. II. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1833. NO. 38.

FREE UNIVERSAL MAGAZINE.

Some months ago, Br A. B G. brought to light certain queries which excited considerable interest in Hanover, Pa. about A. D. 1795. Information concerning the author of the queries was gathered from the work, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. The following Essay is taken from the number for March, 1793. It is republished, as well for the excellent reasoning it contains, as to show the similarity of style and language between the general tenor of the Essay and the preamble to the queries above referred to. A. C. T.

"——But he that built all things is God."—*Heb. iii, 4.*

A wise builder, when he is about to perform any building, prior to his striking one stroke towards that building, he is fixed in his intention, what to perform; the plan by which he means to bring about this performance is devised, and the first stroke that he strikes, is expressive not only of the builders design, but also of his disposition, and expectation fully to effect the same.

His wisdom will not suffer him to make the attempt till he has first sit down and well considered the cost, and every obstruction he is capable of informing himself of, that ever might occur to prevent the accomplishment of the desired effect; lest after he has attempted, if he should fail to effect what he has made an attempt to effect; all that behold him begin to mock him and say, this man began to build and was not able to finish. After (by due consideration) the builder finds he is capable to execute his design—without the least failure, he declares [by an attempt he makes] to all that behold, that he has a disposition to execute some design, and that he really expects to effect the same; and therefore he makes the attempt; and the first stroke that he strikes is the attempt.

Now if God, the great architect of the world, is the former of that noble part of creation called man, he must, consistent with his infinite wisdom, prior to his first attempt towards such performance, have been fixed in his intention what to effect; the plan by which he meant to bring about this performance must have been devised; and God's first attempt in creating man, was expressive not only of his disposition to effect a certain design, but also that he expected to effect that certain design, and therefore he made the attempt.

If God is unchangeable in his disposition, and if he is not liable to be disappointed in his expectations, but is fully able to effect without the least failure all that he made an attempt to effect, then he will never leave room for any of his enemies to say, this God made an attempt to execute, and expected to have executed a certain design concerning man, in which he has been frustrated, and disappointed, or that this God began to build, and was not able to finish.

The end or effect is always, when known, a true demonstration of what the original design was; except when the effector has changed from his first intentions, or has been frustrated; but neither of these can be applied to God, because he can neither change nor be frustrated.

Therefore, if some of God's creatures [as some say] are eternally excluded from happiness into the regions of endless woe; then they must have been originally designed of God for that very end, and if so [as sin cannot be a motive to excite God to act contrary to his own nature] then it is clear, that sin could not have been the cause of their being excluded from happiness into the regions of endless woe, neither could it have been any fault at all in any degree whatever in the creature that was the cause of it, but it must have been the very essence and nature of God that was the cause of their eternal woe. And as damnation, [or condemnation] could not have taken place without sin; sin must only be the instrument by which the end or design [for which those creatures were brought into existence] is effected.

Furthermore, if that be the case, then it is evident, that this design of God is effected altogether consistent with the principle and nature of the devil; for none will deny that it was consistent with the principle and nature of the devil to make men sin, and to make man miserable. But,

To return—if on the other hand, God did not originally design to excluae any of his creatures from happiness, into the regions of endless woe, but if he originally designed man for happiness and for glory; then contrary to the nature and principle of the devil, the designs of Jehovah shall be effected [notwithstanding all the oppositions of the powers of darkness, or the predictions of satan, or his interpreters] to the confusion of God's enemies, and glory of his own name, in the salvation of all; for whatever God's original designs were concerning the final state of man [as well as every thing else] shall to all intents and purposes be effected. So be it, O God.

Let me here yet observe, that the designs of God are all absolute, and do proceed solely from his own essence and nature, independent of any of the persuasions, or temptations of the devil; and independent of any of the motives which the devil is, or ever was capable of presenting to God's view, in order to influence him; therefore all the designs of God are unalterable and unfrustrable.

Original.

Letter to Rev. SYMMES C. HENRY, *Hightstown, N.J.*

SIR—The only apology I shall offer for thus publicly addressing you, is the desire which I feel to serve the cause of truth, and because I think that your conduct at the funeral of the late *Wm. I. Ely*, of this village demands an exposure.

As no convenient opportunity, was had to take down notes of your discourse, as it was delivered, I shall be under the necessity of quoting from memory, and for the correctness of what I state, I appeal to those who, like myself, were attentive listeners to your discourse on the above occasion.

Your text I recollect was taken from Job xiv, 14. Your introductory remarks, concerning the mutability of things, and the tendency of all that is earthly to corruption, change and decay, were certainly just and proper, and befitting the occasion upon which you spoke. Had you confined these remarks to earth, and things of earth, they would not have excited surprise and astonishment in your hearers, and might have passed without censure. But when you ventured into the invisible world, and proceeded to point out the defectable nature of things that are heavenly and divine, I did think you had ventured upon forbidden ground, and entered with your remarks a place which no mortal has a right to enter.

It appeared to be a prominent object with you to establish in the minds of your hearers, the idea that sin and sinners could find no place in heaven, nor ever have a hope to enter there; and yet, in the very face of this declaration, repeatedly made, you had the presumption to assert that sin had its origin there, and that the greatest sinner, and father of all sinners owned it as his birth place!—that he was originally one of the most perfect beings that God could create, and as an angel of light moved foremost in the ranks of heaven, and led the celestial host that unceasingly praise around the throne of God. That notwithsanding he was thus created, pure, holy, and happy, and next to Deity received the highest honors of the court of heaven, he became proud and rebellious, and attempted to usurp the throne of God himself. A pitched battle ensued, and for a time the empire of the universe was held in doubtful contest. Terror and dismay seized the ranks of heaven, till finally, satan was defeated and thrust down to hell. Had you reversed the decision, and stated that satan won the battle and succeeded to the empire, you would have added another prop to the cause of Calvinism, and done more to make your creed consistent than any that have gone before you. From this supposed rebellion, you drew the conclusion that all but God himself must be subject to continual changes, and summed up the matter by saying, that "God cannot make an incorruptible being," or words to that amount. This statement it is presumed you will not deny, if you do, it shall be proved by witnesses sufficient to establish every word.

And were you serious, sir, in making this declaration? Do you really believe that God cannot make an incorruptible being? If so, upon what depends your hopes of eternal felicity? Where the prospect of an endless life? For if God cannot make an incorruptible being, who can? And if they be not made incorruptible, immutable, and unchangeable, how can they be happy? Every one may discover at first view that the declaration amounts to a denial of the doctrine of an endless life. Excellent consolation this to carry to the christian breast! Well calculated to dry the mourner's tears, and heal the wounds that grief has made!!

I need not ask you, sir, whence you derived your information as to the rebellion in heaven, or how you became acquainted with the defectable nature of heavenly things? These questions have been too oft presented to, and left unanswered by those of your faith, to need a repetition from me.

You next stated something of what were the requirements of the word of God, which by the way I think are not to be found therein, or certain qualifications which every individual must possess here, or have no hope of heaven or happiness hereafter. These qualifications you must have been aware the deceased did not possess, and not possessing them, you consigned him as surely to the abodes of dark despair as words could express that idea. You certainly did justice to the memory of the departed, when

you stated that he had been a moral, industrious, worthy, and upright man—one who was respected and esteemed by his neighbors, and acquaintances, and cited in proof of the fact, the numbers, respectability and devout attention, of those who had assembled on that occasion. And you as certainly by implication landed his soul in hell! You did not, it is true, declare to your audience that his soul was at that moment in the sulphurous pit, but your manner of stating the requirements was such, as unavoidably led to that conclusion.

And is this the balm you would apply to the wounded spirit? Is this the method you would take to dry the mourner's tear? the cordial you have provided to assuage the pangs of grief? Heartless and unfeeling messenger of cruel tidings! Was it not enough that you beheld a disconsolate widow and her fatherless children, deprived by this visitation of the hand of providence of a husband, and father, their dependence and support for the affairs of life—was it not enough that you saw their tears and heard their sad lamentations, but must you deprive them of their last hope, that he had gone to better and brighter scenes, by telling them, that instead thereof, he had gone———but I forbear. The subject is too affecting for one whose feelings have not been rendered callous by the cruel dogmas of partial and contracted minds.

There are other parts of your discourse which were equally exceptionable with those I have already named, but as I have exceeded the limits I had prescribed to myself, when I commenced, I shall proceed no further, but conclude by expressing the hope that the time is far distant when you will have an opportunity to insult the memory of another individual, merely because he did not subscribe to your creed.

Respectfully yours, S. C. BULKELEY.

Hightstown, July 5th, 1833

Original.

A SINGULAR OBJECTION.

"The doctrine of Universal Salvation is a very pleasing doctrine, and it suits the carnal heart." We think this a very singular and strange objection. Does the objector say that the fact of this doctrine's being "very pleasing," is sufficient to refute it? if so, what may *not* be refuted, that is pleasing? Should any religious faith or tenet, however high a claim it may lay to truth, be discarded because it is *pleasing?*—Does the belief in the being of the immaculate God, afford us any *pleasure*—does the faith in Jesus Christ as 'the propitiation for our sins' and a firm hope in the resurrection to life and immortality yield any joy and pleasure, then we should relinquish such a faith because it is '*very pleasing.*'

A father places his child under the tuition and care of a faithful preceptor: he watches with parental solicitude his progress in the solid sciences; it affords him pleasure to see his precious lad advancing with rapid strides up the "hill of science;" he feels satisfied that his child views his studies to be "very pleasing," and he takes pleasure in anticipating the period when his youthful charge will perhaps fill a station with credit to himself and benefit to community. This being the case, must not the son *cease* to study, must he not be prevented from tasting the "Pierian Spring" because it is "*very pleasing*"? Does it become pleasing for a child to honor his parents—for the christian to do his duty? they should cease to do so, if Universalism is to be rejected because it is "*very pleasing.*" The Psalmist says, "I delight to do thy will O Lord, I delight in thy law." He exhorts to "Sing praises unto the name of the Lord for it is *pleasant*," but really we do not hear him urging it as an *objection against* doing the will of Jehovah, and singing his praises, that "*it is very pleasing.*"

If Universalism is a *pleasing* doctrine, why may we not infer that Partialism is *displeasing?* and is it not true that the doctrine of unending misery *cannot* bring to its believers delight and joy? Who has ever made the concession that *this* is a pleasing doctrine?

A friend of ours who professes to be orthodox in his religious views, once declared with great fervency in a prayer-meeting that he "thanked God there was a *hell for the wicked.*" This is not the spirit which David manifested: he calls upon us 25 times in one of his Psalms to praise God for his *goodness*, not for his "*infinite wrath.*" He says, "enter into his gates with thanksgiving and into his courts with praise: be *thankful* unto him and bless his name." And *why?* because he has built a direful prison-house, a "*hell for the wicked*"?—No! "*For the Lord is good;* his mercy is everlasting, and his truth endureth to all generations." It must be a fiend-like gratification that takes its rise from a contemplation of the unspeakable agonies of sensitive beings; *that* must be a *strange* gratitude which originates from a faith in the eternal wrath of the Deity. But if our friend or any other individual finds it "very pleasing" to believe in the doctrine of "Hell-torments," he should renounce such a faith, it is so "*very pleasing.*" We *do* think that it reflects more honor and benevolence on a christian to hope and believe with *pleasure* in the salvation of *all*, than to *rejoice* in the *damnation* of ever so small a portion—if there is "joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth," must we be deemed unholy and vile, must our sentiments be branded with the appellation of "abominable heresy" because we find it pleasing and joyful to believe that *all will* come to repentance?

But "Universalism suits the carnal heart."—By a "carnal heart" we presume the objector means as the apostle did when he says, "the carnal mind is enmity against God, it is not subject to the law of God." Now to be subject to the law of God is to *love* Him, and is it not a fact that the more beauty and love we discover in the character of the Deity, the greater our confidence in his *good will* and *loving kindness*, the *greater* will be our love, and the *less* our enmity? Universalists are complained of for "eternally harping" on the *love* and *benevolence* of God, the *very acknowledged means* to produce *love* and take away the "carnal heart," or "enmity to God's law," yet here we are gravely told that "Universalism *suits* the carnal heart;" as tho' the faith that God is our Father and friend, that He is the very essence of love, produces *enmity* towards him. It is not so; Universalism ("the faith once delivered to the saints" if you wish a softer term) finds its congenial abode in *that* bosom from which is banished "enmity to God," by an indwelling consciousness of the Divine perfections and his disposition to do *all* his intelligent creatures *good*. The stronger our confidence is in the grace and mercy of our Almighty Parent, or in other words, in proportion as we believe in the doctrine of Universalism so will our *love* be increased and our *enmity* consequently diminished, and where there is *no enmity* there is no "*carnal heart.*" Then *how* we ask does it appear that *believing* God loves us, or *hoping* that he loves us, or *desiring* that he may always love us, and the race of Adam, suits the "carnal heart" or produces "enmity to his law." It appears to us that there might be some plausibility in this objection if Universalists taught and believed that there is *pleasure* in sin, and that iniquity points the transgressor to beds of flowers where he may be lulled to sweet repose by the siren voice of carnal sensuality. It teaches no such thing. It assures the sinner that if he lends an ear to the enticements of carnal appetites and passions, he must taste "the worm-wood and the gall," that if vice holds out its insignia in the most fascinating allurements, misery and death lie concealed under its specious garb. It assures the transgressor that there is no peace to the wicked," that if sensuality, and Intemperance, and ungodliness *do* promise pleasure—do they call any to recline on beds of ambrosial roses, underneath lie serpents that hiss and scorpions which destroy. Do such sentiments suit the carnal heart?

But again; Does the objector believe that faith and final perseverance will save those who are exercised thereby? Yes. Does he *desire* that all men, "rich and poor bond and free" may have faith and persevere to the end? We presume he does. This is no more nor less than the "heart's desire" of the sincere Universalist. But is not this a sad sign that the objector is "*carnal* sold under sin.----If his objection is valid, do not such desires "suit the carnal heart." Does the objector *pray* that "all may come to the knowledge of the truth," that all may know God from the least to the greatest and be made heirs of his grace? Yes. But does not such a prayer betray a "carnal heart." This is the Universalist's constant petition; but there is this grand difference, the one has *faith* that his prayer will be answered, and the other has not. The objector and the advocates of the doctrine which he opposes, both desire, both *pray* for the salvation of the world; here then is the "middle wall of partition," the one *believes* that all will be saved, the other does not. If as the apostle declares, "whatsoever is not of faith is *sin*," and that men should "pray without wrath and *doubting*," we leave our opposing brother to say which of us two has the "carnal heart," hoping that he may not long remain among those whose "spirit prays, but whose understanding is unfruitful." B. B. H.

SALVATION BY WORKS.

Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do, for his good pleasure.—*Phillip. ii, 12, 13.*

Many suppose it very unscriptural to talk of effecting our salvation by our own exertions; yet it is certain that the scriptures enjoin this very work upon us as a duty, and represent it as altogether practicable: "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," says the foregoing passage. St. Paul thus charges Timothy: "Take heed to thyself, and to thy doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this, *thou* shalt both *save thyself and them that hear thee.*" Here the apostle speaks of Timothy's saving not only *himself*, but *others* also. And the same apostle says of himself, "I am made all things to all men, that *I* might by all means *save some.*" Nothing can be plainer than that these passages expressly declare that we may save ourselves, and others too.

The reason why people have supposed that man can do nothing towards his salvation, is, that they have in the first place grossly mistaken the meaning of the scripture terms, *salvation, saved*, &c. They have meant one thing by *salvation*, while the scriptures mean another. *To be saved*, people have generally imagined, is to be delivered from God's wrath, and to be made the object of his love; and they have fancied *salvation* to be only a preservation from an endless hell to which the Almighty's anger was driving them, and an admittance into heaven which God's love then opens for their reception. In one word, salvation has been commonly supposed to be nothing else than the securing of the eternal welfare of the soul. Now, if this were what the scriptures mean by salvation, it would indeed be proper to say that men can do nothing towards it; for what could he, or any other being, do to change the unchangeable God, and to make him love those whom he be-

fore hated? or who will be so impious as to contend that God takes care *not* to secure the eternal welfare of his own offspring, but chooses to leave it altogether uncertain whether the immortality to which he decrees them, shall prove a blessing, or a hideous, irretrievable curse? The probability is, that people have often *meant* correctly when they have said that we can do nothing towards our salvation; for they probably have frequently *meant* nothing else by the expression, than that we can do nothing towards rendering our final happiness more sure than it already is, in the plan of God: or that we neither can, nor need do any thing to prevent our heavenly Father from inflicting some revengeful, unmerciful torture upon us. If this be what they intend, their *meaning* is certainly correct; but still they use an improper and unscriptural phrase to express it.

What the scriptures mean by salvation, is, deliverance, not from endless torture, nor from God's hatred, neither of which ever existed, but from *ignorance and sin*. Accordingly, when one is converted to christianity, he is said, in the scriptures, to be *already* saved: "to us who *are* saved," says St. Paul; and again: "he saved us, *by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost*." Here let us ask, how does Christ save us? Answer: by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; that is, when we are *washed* in the laver of regeneration, and have the Holy Spirit renewed in our hearts, then we are saved from our former pollution and evil spirit. This perfectly agrees with the definition which the angel gave of the salvation that Christ should administer: "thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people *from their sins*."

Let the reader now fix this truth in his mind, viz. that salvation is *deliverance*, not from endless perdition, nor from infinite vengeance, but *from sin*, and then ask himself whether the injunction, "work out your own salvation," be not perfectly rational. Work out your own deliverance from sin, work out the purification of your minds, subdue your unruly passions, regulate your desires and affections, make yourselves more and more acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, bring yourselves to conformity with the law of right, become virtuous;—is there any thing impracticable or unreasonable in this?

But the reader will now say, "though I see nothing impracticable or unreasonable in the matter as now explained, yet the writer has just quoted passages which declare that it is *Christ* who saves us from *sin*, and that it is *he* who saves us by the washing of regeneration, &c.—How is this fact to be reconciled with what the writer, and indeed with what the Bible also says of saving ourselves, working out our own salvation?" &c. The latter clause of the passage which stands at the head of this communication, will serve to lay open this seeming mystery: "it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." In other words, it is God who, by various means, influences the wills of men, and induces them to work out their salvation from sin. The same may be said of Christ: he takes away the sin of the world, by leading men to repentance, and by inclining them to forsake their evil ways, and to turn unto the Lord.

The whole of this subject may be reduced to the meanest capacity by supposing a familiar case: A parent has a number of children, very ignorant and very vicious. With all wisdom and prudence, he devotes himself to their instruction and reformation. He teaches them; and at last by much care and vigilance, he overcomes their indolence and brings them to study. They study, they make more and more improvement, and at length become masters of their respective parts. Here, the parent *wrought* in the minds of his children both *to will* and *to do* of his good pleasure; he was the immediate cause of their exertions, and their exertions were the immediate cause of their learning. It would be perfectly proper to say both that parent had given his children knowledge, and still that they had acquired it; for the fact is, it was the parent who made them acquire it. And it would be perfectly proper for the parent, while he was operating on his children's minds, to say to them, "work out, each of you, your own lessons;" this injunction itself would be a stimulus, urging them on in the work. Then again the parent embraces every opportunity, and uses every motive to reform them from their vicious habits. He wins their affections; he then makes their love to him a restraint upon the indulgence of those dispositions he wishes to prevent; he shows them in what their enjoyment consists; he accustoms them to rule their tempers, and subdue their passions; he awakens in them a love of propriety, and finally of all that is virtuous and noble. He now sees his work accomplished, for he has made them work out their deliverance from the character which they formerly possessed.

HINTS TO UNIVERSALISTS.

Brethren--Upon the supposition that you have formed, or are about to form yourselves into a religious society, I will now proceed to suggest such duties as appear to me, to be incumbent on you.

1. See how much you can do for the support of preaching. You know if a preacher devotes his time and talents to the study of theology, he must have something to feed and clothe himself, and *family*, if he have one. If he does not own the means of conveyance he must either hire or go on foot, and in either of these cases, he subjects himself to an expense, which he has reason to expect the people will defray. If you are unable to pay any thing at all, and if he can come to you without running himself in debt, I have no doubt he will do it at your request. If you are not as able to do something for him, as he is to preach for nothing, I presume on hearing a statement of your circumstances, he will agree to preach for nothing, and find himself; at least I know of *one* that will do it.

You can not, therfore, say that the want of means prevents your hearing the truth, even if you have no means at all. But this seldom if ever occurs. There is scarcely a man living, that does not in the course of a year, spend money which might have been appropriated to the support of the gospel, without robbing him of the least particle of food or raiment.

Again. You must not depend altogether on the amount you can get subscribed, to determine the degree of liberality and engagedness of the professed friends; for there are always some in society, who think the pay-day is always *to-morrow*, and to-morrow never comes; and when they subscribe, they do it without even *thinking* how they should contrive to pay it. I deem it important to be particular upon this point, because the pecuniary concerns of a Society have a direct and powerful bearing upon its prosperity. Your own judgement will tell you that punctuality is the life of business. For want of it I have known societies to sink and become nerveless and palsied. With it, they can scarcely fail to rise and prosper.

How necessary, then, that your accounts should be annually, if not half yearly, settled. He that ministers to you, may live on credit, and if so, must depend upon you for the means to fulfil his own word. Will you not keep his credit good? Those that subscribe for preaching, will always pay more cheerfully, and be more engaged to hear the preaching, if called upon to *pay down*, than if permitted to let it remain to the end of the term, for which the preacher is engaged. My readers know the old adage about 'paying for a *dead horse*;' and you will find, brethren, that paying for preaching a year or two, or even six months after you have received it is somewhat similar in its effect. Men are apt to determine the worth of an article by its cost; and this remark will hold true with regard to preaching. I know of neighborhoods, where they have always had preaching for nothing, and I find it generally the case, that they care no more for it than for the wind that blows. They seem to think the minister is under obligations to them for *hearing* him; and in fact this may be the case in some instances; but I speak of it as the general and prevalent feeling among them.

I am fully persuaded, that where subscriptions remain unpaid for a long time, a similar feeling obtains. And when a Society has a debt hanging upon its shoulders, the wheels will run heavy—indifference will soon follow, and thus for want of energy and punctuality, they may become like 'trees withered, and plucked up by the roots.' 'This is a hard saying; who can hear it?' It is, nevertheless, true. If you would prosper—if you would have your neighbors join your Society, you must keep clear of quag-mires and sand-banks, keep your pecuniary matters all straight, and thus show them that you stand on dry ground, and a hard bottom.—*Religious Inquirer*.

THE CONTRAST.

How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord God of Host.—Psalm lxxxiv. 1.

This is the sentiment of a devotional mind—a mind sensible of the goodness of God, expanded with a love of him, and humbled with a sense of his greatness and glory. A person of such a mind enters the tabernacle of the Lord God of hosts, and worships him there from pure and holy motives. He delights to render homage to the Being of infinite goodness—his soul, overflowing with joy and gratitude, cannot satisfy its desires in no other way than in the manifestation and acknowledgment of its holy sensations. It contemplates with the richest felicity its own relationship with God—it recounts the proofs and pledges of his love which it has received, and in all the fullness of exstacy it prostrates itself at the foot of the divine altar, and pours out its libations of gratitude, humility and praise. It was undoubtedly in a moment of silent, sincere devotion, when his soul was transported with the joy of divine worship, that David uttered, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord God of Hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth, for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God. For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand; I had rather be a door keeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness."

What a striking contrast is there between the feelings of David and those of such people as say that they would not be seen in the tabernacles of God, nor worship him, nor obey his commandments, if they believed there was no hell torments in a future world. David does not inform us that it was the fear of hell which induced him to worship God. He longed, he even fainted for the courts of the Lord; his heart and flesh cried out for the living God. When a person loves God, he worships him for the satisfaction which pure worship affords. If he do not love him, he will not love to worship him; it is impossible for him to worship him rightly. The fear of hell may drive him to prostrate himself before God, but there is no devotion in such an act; it is very like the act of the people of Babylon, who fell down before Nebuchadnezzar's golden image.

RELIGION AND FEELING.

Conceive two real christians listening to a sermon in which the preacher is discoursing from such a text as this—'Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another;" or this—"Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus, who though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that ye, through his poverty might become rich."—His object, as that of every man should be who preaches from such a text, is to show that a sense of divine love to *us*, should fill *us* with benevolence towards others. In order to bring the heart to feel its obligation, he gives a vivid description of God's love to man, and then, while his hearers are affected with God's mercy, he calls upon them, in imitation of Jehovah, to relieve those who are in want; to bear with those who are vexatious; to forgive those who have injured them; to lay aside their wrath, and abound in all the expressions of genuine affection to their fellow christians. One of the individuals is deeply interested by the first part of the discourse, sheds many tears, and is wrought up to a high pitch of feeling, while the preacher paints in glowing colors the love of God; the other hears with fixed attention, with genuine faith, the *whole* sermon, but his emotions are not powerful; he feels it is true, but it is tranquil feeling, unattend either by smiles or tears. They go home; the latter perhaps in silence, the former exclaiming 'Oh, what a delightful sermon! what a precious season! did you ever hear the love of God so impressively, so beautifully described?" With all his feeling, however, he does not go forth to relieve one child of want, nor does he attempt to extinguish one angry or implacable feeling towards one individual who had offended him. He is as passionate and unforgiving, as unkind and selfish, after the sermon, as he was before he heard it. The other retires with more of calm reflection than of strong emotion. Harken to his soliloquy: 'The preacher has given us a most astonishing idea of the love of God to us, and most clearly and affectingly deduced from it our obligations to love one another. Am I interested in this love? What! has this ineffable grace lavished all its benefits on *me* a sinner? And shall I not feel this love constraining me to relieve the wants, to heal the sorrows, to forgive the offences of my fellow creatures? I will bear ill-will no longer; I will put out the kindling spark of revenge; I will go in a spirit of meekness and love, and forgive the offender, and be reconciled to my brother.' By that grace on which he depended, he is enabled to act up to his resolution. He becomes upon principle, upon conviction, more merciful, more meek, more affectionate. Which has most feeling? The former. Which has most religion? The latter.

Any emotion, however pleasurable or intense, that does not lead to action, is mere natural, not holy, feeling: while that, however feeble it may seem, which leads to the will of God, is unfeigned piety. In order to ascertain our degree of religion, we must not merely ask how we feel under sermons, but how this feeling leads us to act afterwards. The operative strength of our principles, and not the contemplative strength of our feelings, is the test of godliness. All that imaginative emotion produced by a sense of God's love to us, which does not lead to a cultivation of the virtue of christian love, is one of the delusive fires, which, instead of guiding aright, misleads the souls of men.—*Extract from Sermon, Charity Explained, by Rev. J. A. James.*

HOPE.

There is no subject on which the mind of the christian dwells with more interest, pleasure and profit, charity alone excepted, than on the glorious theme of hope—divine hope. It presents in every engaging form, those objects and riches, which are as immeasurable as they are lasting and fadeless. The scriptures employ the word hope, in its true grammatical import, implying a confidence in, and a blissful expectation of that immortality and glory, revealed in the gospel of God our Savior. The language of the record is, 'In hope of eternal life, which God who cannot lie promised before the world began.' 'That we might have strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.' 'Looking for that glorious hope' &c. Hope then, in its true and scriptural meaning, implies a religious unwavering confidence in 'the great and precious promises of God,' in which a future, happy, unending existence is brought to light. And what doctrine, what truth can be more admirably calculated to sustain and cheer and bless the anxious soul of man, than one which is thus embraced in a well grounded hope? It is verily, as an 'anchor to the soul both sure and steadfast entering within the veil where Jesus our forerunner hath for us entered.' Though we may be tossed and driven about on the troublous waters of this uncertain mortal state, and the bark of life seem to be driven furiously towards the dangerous rocks which threaten our utter destruction, yet, by casting out the anchor of hope, it soon finds a strong and sustaining bottom, and keeps us within the harbor of safety and protection. A voice from the clouds is heard by the believing soul, saying, 'Peace be still!' and lo, there is a great calm. The loud tempest dies away; the dark clouds are dispersed, and the broad sunlight of life eternal, beams upon the heart with an all-cheering influence.—*Universalist.*

THE VICTIM.

'Twas midnight—the golden god of day was extinguished—the weary winds had forgot to blow—the gentle gales had fanned themselves to sleep—oppressed with unwonted sorrow, I sought the meanderings of the majestic Connecticut. All nature wore a pleasing form; the firmament was cloudless, clear and purely beautiful; the stars in thronging multitudes glittered through the blue depth of heaven with peculiar brilliancy; nought was heard save the faint warblings of some cheerful tenant of the bough, and the undulation of the passing stream.

As I was listening to the murmurings of the restless waters, musing upon the grand works of the great Creator, I was startled with the sound of hopeless misery. I paused—'twas the wild moanings of a phrensied woman! She was alone, pale, wo-worn and dejected; upon her face was the tint of grief—the settled shadow of an inward struggle; she looked as tho' she had sorrowed much—her haggard countenance too plainly showed it. Anon, she seated herself upon the trunk of a scathed oak, whose branches once towered in silent grandeur to the clouds—leaning her throbbing head on her snowy, quivering hands, and as it were with a convulsion.——She talked of joys blighted—of hopes withered—withered by the ruthful fears of a vindictive God—of the gloomy terrors of an unending hell—of her child that death had wrung from her fond embrace—of its being doomed to dwell with everlasting burnings—and deep melancholy mingled with every line. Then rose again. Bitter was her anguish, tears in torrents flowed down the cheek where beauty once sat triumphant. She threw around her a wild, desparing look. Then, with lightning's speed she ascended a rugged and desolate cliff, whose soaring summit hung over the gurgling stream. Prostrate she knelt—raised her streaming eyes to heaven, and uttered a prayer so sad, but so sweet, it was like the song of a spirit. She rose—short thick sobs came fast from her burthened heart. Her phrenzy was gone, but a calm was there, a fearful calm, like that before the earthquake. She leaped into the yawning gulf; a shriek, a struggle, and the undulating waves closed forever over *the victim of the cruel dogma of endless misery!!—Religious Inquirer.*

DOMESTIC HAPPINESS.

Who that has ever travelled in the country, that has gazed with delight upon the romantic and variagated scenery there presented, has not witnessed in the course of his travels the delight and happiness which cluster around the humble firesides of frugal farmers? You may "pause amid the wrecks of time" and the monuments of by-gone days, view with astonishment and surprise the splendid and massive specimens which mark the onward progress of the sciences and arts, clamber the snow-capt summits of Himmaleh, pierce the interminable beds of ice that clustre around the poles, bask in the Italian sun, or revel in all the sweets of a torrid or a more temperate zone. These may carry a momentary thrill of joy to the soul, but compare them to the bliss and happiness which are included in the hut of the honest cottager, and they are annihilated like the mist before the rising sun. O, it is sweet to the laborer, after the fatigues of the day are past and night throws her sable veil over nature, to partake of his homely fare in the presence of a wife and children whom he loves, and in the bosom of that hallowed circle "to teach the young idea how to shoot," and to watch the buddings of the infantile mind!—it is more sweet than to repose in beds of down, and revel in luxuries torn from the bosom of innocence and extorted from the widow and orphan. It is in contemplating such a scene that the mind finds itself constrained to say, "that if perfect happiness dwells in sublunary regions, this must be its abode and seat.

RICHES.

What are they? Who is rich? Is it he who has fifty thousand dollars, or one hundred thousand dollars, or one million of dollars? Kings are beggars sometimes on their thrones, and merchants whose ships float on every sea, yet a poor mechanic has enough to lend. To be rich is to want nothing; to have no wishes which you cannot gratify; and the term "getting rich," should not mean laying up money, but retrenching superfluous desires. Napoleon, with his imperial power, was more a slave than a common soldier, who received a certain stipend a day, however mean. Wealth brings wants "hills on hills and alps on alps arise." It is incompatible with true independence. Diogenes was richer than Alexander. The one had all he desired in the warmth of the sun; the other, although master of a world, wept over the narrowness of his power.—*New-York Mirror.*

SWEARING.

Swearing is void of all plea. It is not the native offspring of the soul: not interwoven with the texture of the body, nor any way allied to our frame. For as a great man (Tillotson) expresses it, 'though some men pour out oaths as if they were natural, yet no man was ever born with a swearing constitution.' But it is a custom, picked up by low and paltry spirits, who have no sense of honor, no regard to decency; but are forced to substitute some rhapsody of nonsense to supply the vacancy of good sense. Hence the silliness of the practice can only be equalled by the silliness of those who adopt it.

Life is a flower garden in which new blossoms are ever opening as fast as others fade. Nature is the mirror of the Invisible one.

Where children are, is a golden age.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE, NEW-YORK, AND ABEL C. THOMAS, PHILADELPHIA.

SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1833.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES

At the Orchard-street Church, and at the New Church in Sixth Avenue, foot of Amity-street commence regularly every Sabbath at half past *ten* in the morning—half past *three* in the afternoon, and at *eight* in the evening.

RIGHTEOUSNESS' SAKE.

"But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye."
1 Peter iii, 14.

We should carefully avoid confounding punishment with suffering. Punishment always presupposes, not only guilt, but a *consciousness* of guilt, on the part of the individual upon whom it is inflicted; but there may be suffering where there has been no guilt. Else why speak of suffering for *righteousness'* sake? "Jesus Christ the righteous" "*suffered* the just for the unjust;"—not that the *punishment* deserved by the unjust was inflicted on the Savior—not that he was *punished*, in any sense—but that he *suffered* in a righteous cause. Paul and his co-workers in the Gospel ministry, suffered in like manner—and that they suffered for *righteousness'* sake will not be disputed. He who suffers for *evil-doing* is properly said to be *punished*—while he who endures privation, and tribulation, and reproach, in *well doing*, is justly said to *suffer* for the sake of righteousness.

The passage of scripture placed at the head of this article, may with much propriety be used in addressing Universalists. I shall consider it in three divisions—the *fact*, *cause*, and *consequence*.

1st. The *fact* that Universalists suffer many things from the opposing denominations, is too notorious to require proof. The particular nature of their suffering is not so well understood, and therefore deserves a passing remark. The alienation of the affection and friendship of kindred and former friends, is not the smallest item in the catalogue of the Universalist's sufferings. The cold salutation, the suspicious look, the distant bearing—these things must be expected by the believer in the promises of God. These things were suffered by the Master, by his immediate disciples, & by all the primitive christians. They have been suffered by all the followers of the Lamb; and should *we* expect—should we *desire* to escape them?

But the alienation of the affection and friendship of kindred and former friends, is only a part of the Universalist's suffering. He must expect reproaches of various kinds. If he is of the number of those of whom God is *especialy* the Savior, he will be called to "labor and *suffer* reproach." Jesus was charged with having a devil—with being a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber—a friend of publicans and sinners—a dangerous man, &c. Similar reproaches must be expected by the members of the Savior's household. Our motives will continue to be called in question—our characters will still be assailed by secret inuendo; and 'pious fraud' will still be resorted to as the only means of lessening our influence in society. These things we have already suffered, and we have no reason to expect a different state of affairs until the spirit of the religion of Christ is more widely manifested as the governing principle of the religious world.

2d. Having noticed the *fact* that Universalists suffer, let us bring to view the *cause*. It is not pretended by our opposing brethren, that Univeralists are less moral than other denominations of Christians. Be sure, there are a few fanatical Partialists who take every opportunity of assailing the general character of our denomination. The zeal of such men, however, is condemned by the more considerate of their own faith; and we may as well pass by their defamatory reports without farther notice. The sufferings of Universalists are not caused by any suspicions that we are less moral than our neighbors. Nor is it our *faith* that subjects us to these things. Were we to say nothing about our distinguishing sentiment—and were we to sit down quietly in partialist churches, and give our support to sentiments which we utterly disbelieve—all would be well. That is, were we thus to do, we should not be called upon to suffer alienation of affection and friendship, reproaches, &c.

That Universalists suffer for righteousness' sake, is obvious—for our sufferings are caused by the unreserved avowel and defence of our honest sentiments. Mark well! no matter what we might believe, if we only kept it to ourselves, we should not be called upon to suffer the reproaches of our brethren. It is not simply our *faith*—but the *open avowal and defence* of it, that causes the difficulty. Do we act righteously in openly declaring what we sincerely believe? Surely we do. Then it is obvious that *we suffer for righteousness' sake.*

How often have Universalists been told, that if they only would keep quiet, they might still retain their standing in the church;—they might *secretly* enjoy their sentiments, &c. All this confirms what I have already remarked, viz., that the difficulty referred to, arises from the *righteous avowal and defence*, of a solemn conviction of the truth of heaven!

3d. The third point to be noticed, is the *consequence*. By this I mean, the consequence of suffering in the manner referred to. "But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, *happy are ye*." Notwithstanding the trials to which we are subject, and the reproaches we suffer, still we can set our seal to the truth of the declaration, that they are happy who suffer for righteousness' sake. And that happiness flows, in a great measure, from a *consciousness* that we suffer, not for evil-doing, but for well-doing.—We feel that we are performing our duty, and no more than our duty, in declaring the unsearchable riches of Christ. The joy-inspiring assurance of universal blessedness, prompts a desire that others might come to the knowledge of the truth; and in spreading abroad the glad news of salvation, we enjoy a satisfaction unknown to the cringing hypocrite, who bows at the altar of Baal to win the favor of an unbelieving world.

Let these considerations incite every Universalist to unwearied diligence in the great and good work. Remember, that whatever reproaches we suffer, are suffered for *the sake of righteousness*—for the righteous *avowal* and *defence* of "the faith once delivered to the saints." A. C. T.

For the Christian Messenger.

MR. EDITOR,

Dear Sir—As you have attacked me personally, I trust you will be just enough to let me defend my moral character against your insinuations through the same medium. It was the uncharitable course of many Universalist Editors in abusing all who did not see with them, that conspired with other things to turn my mind. I admit that I was as bad as any of them, and therefore know how to pity them. If you cannot understand the real meaning of the inspired writings better than you seem to understand my renunciation, I should not wonder if you greatly erred. I did not design it should "bear the least appearance of *detraction*." I only wished to state what I really believed to be the truth in relation to the effects of the doctrine. And I cheerfully admitted there were many good persons in the belief, and that its advocates were probably sincere and honest.

All that I said of the general effects of the doctrine, has been acknowledged by many candid and honest Universalists. Even *Paul Dean* of Boston, (as good and sincere a christian as lives, and who preached Universalism for years,) wrote me that my statements in relation to the doctrine were correct, and that many of the Eastern preachers of the doctrine were becoming convinced of it. I did not think the "*long story*" was any longer than was necessary to explain myself. And I did not apply any "*hard names*" to Universalists.

I said I had *reason* to expect my motives would be assailed. You take for granted that I had no *reason* to expect it. Now if you doubted my having reason to expect it, you should have better informed yourself about it, before you took for granted that I had none. I *had* reasons in abundance. A knowledge of frail human nature was reason enough. A knowledge of human depravity was enough. But many had already assailed my motives in advance, because they believed I was going to renounce the doctrine.

I *did not* "devote columns to telling community how much my motives would be assailed by my *old friends*." No sir, I did not expect my motives would be assailed by any except such as acted themselves from bad motives. I said so. And I number hundreds of old friends who are far above any such wickedness. They will still be my friends, although I am obliged to differ from them in some of my views of religion.

Yes—I will "stand up before the searcher of hearts, and say that I have sincerely believed Universalism, and still affirm that I have seen none of its benign influences." Whatever goodness may have been in me, I think was the result of other causes, and I wish to be distinctly understood that I think many Universalists are good, but not that Universalism makes them any better than they would be without it, and sometimes not so good.

Whether my eyes or yours are jaundiced we must judge of course each for himself. I am sorry that you should think it necessary, to make a personal attack on me for the honest expression of my views on a general subject, in order to promote your cause. That cause must be a bad one which requires such support. I believe it a bad one, and would like to see it abandoned by all, for my children's good, and the good of all men; but yet I give what I claim, and do not wish to injure my fellow men because they cannot see as I see.

You say, "the inference is *plain* that the denomination attempted to buy him." Now sir I believe you are the first man that ever thought I meant any such thing. When you have received offers or proposals for preaching, &c. *as* a promulgator of Universalism have you generally supposed that the "denomination were attempting to buy you *to continue* with them?"

Did you not read the whole renunciation with a strong desire to find something horrible in it? And if there was nothing wrong in its true sense, did you not try to search out some other sense? I only meant that I had been urged to go and had doors opened to me *as* a preacher of Universalism, latterly, in which I could receive much more pay for services, than I can ever expect as a preacher of any other faith, besides that I had voluntarily and knowingly sacrificed some hundred dollars with my own paper, by trying to suit my own conscience more than my readers. I have published the proofs in our country papers, and I have directed one to you.

I have thought that you were very candid for a Universalist Editor. But I am inclined to

think that such men *cannot* see things as they really are. Yet I forgive you, and pray God that your eyes may be opened, if you are in the wrong, and that mine may be, if I am in the wrong.

Whether it was necessary for me to defend my motives from aspersion in my renunciation was a thing you could know nothing about. Had you known what had been said in the region of my paper on the subject before, you might then have formed some just conception about it. There were many persons, who had neither principle nor conscience (to all appearance) who took an interest in my former doctrine, though they did not pretend to believe any thing. They had sometimes assailed my motives for going so distinctly for the Bible and religion. I had reason to expect them to do so still, but I had hopes that honorable Editors would be content to assail my new doctrine and point out its effects without attempting to injure me. That is bad company, which a man cannot get out of without leaving behind him his purse, or what is worse his character. This can find no excuse in my assailing all the denomination of Universalists in that way, for I did not so assail them. I only declared my opinion that the *doctrine* did not tend to reform such as possess bad hearts. I do honestly think so.

I might have made money by selling my names to the *Anchor*, or to Br. *Peck*, Montrose; but I should have been instrumental that way in spreading Universalism, therefore I would not let them have the names, which were useless to me, and for which I might have received about $250. In all, I have sacrificed more than $1000 directly or indirectly by this change—and if I am now wrong, it is a great misfortune enough, without being charged with dishonesty.

Now, dear sir, as you have brought my case before your readers, justice requires that you publish my renunciation entire, and this letter, together with so much of the piece in the newspaper, I send you, as will apply to your remarks about *bribery*, &c. And farther I would say, you had better not meddle with a man that you know nothing about.

With feelings of personal esteem, I am sir, your injured friend. Lewis C. Todd.

July 3d, 1833.

We freely give place to the foregoing as a measure of *courtesy* to Br. Todd. He seems to claim it as a *right*, growing out of "personal attacks" from us. This we are not yet exactly prepared to acknowledge, for we are not conscious of thus "attacking" him. What were the circumstances? *He* had made an "attack" on our denomination. We as public advocates of its doctrines, felt it our duty, or *privilege*, to say the least, to notice his article. What could he expect?—that we should perfectly coincide with him in opinion? Then, of course, to have been honest, we *ought* to have followed him in each particular. *We*, also, should have *renounced* Universalism! But this, with our present views and feelings, would have been rather too great a requirement. We were compelled, (however unfortunately,) to differ with him materially; though we aimed to do it in kindness. And after a candid review of the article, we still are compelled to say we can discover none of those "personal attacks"—that disposition to *assail others* "in order to promote our own cause" of which he so much complains. The reader will also please re-examine it, (he will find it on page 7, of our paper for June 29, No. 35) and see whether he is more fortunate than ourselves.

We do not, however, design here to discuss the question of the "purity" of his motives, or to enter into at this time a particular examination of the communication addressed to ourselves. He will see this have perceived that we have anticipated his request so far as regards the insertion of his renunciation. And he will also find annexed thereto a more explicit exhibition of our views of it.

If we have done him injustice, it is unintentional, and none can regret it more than ourselves. We have been compelled to regard the burden of his article as wholly uncalled for—even as *ungenerous* toward the denomination. If convinced of the fallacy of Universalism, few words would have been requisite to make it known, and charity would have dictated a friendly parting with former associates. It cannot be, he has yet to learn, that if we are in error, we shall be more easily reclaimed by *kindness* and *condescension*, than by being denounced as *infidels*—as *demoralizers*, with the whole catalogue of anti-christian epithets, which limitarians have been in the practice of applying to us time out of mind. But his article with our remarks thereon, are before our readers. They will judge whether we are justly *censurable* in this matter.

We can assure him most fully that we *did not* "read his renunciation with a *strong desire* to find something horrible in it." On the contrary we read it with much interest to learn the nature of the considerations that could induce one to so important an act. We were anxious for a manifestation of the fruits of that *better* spirit which he professed to have found. We need not say we were disappointed. He is already apprized of this. And we have now to add the additional regret we feel in witnessing the spirit that seems to us indicated in some part of his letter. He talks of the "uncharitable course of Universalist Editors"—of "personal attacks for an honest expression of opinion"—of "bad causes" and "bad company" with a warmth of feeling which the circumstances seem hardly to demand. We are sorry to see it, because we regard it quite as sure an evidence of a "bad cause," as "personal attacks for the honest expression of views." The threatening spirit, also, which seems to pervade the closing part of his last paragraph does not strike us favorably at all.

Want of time and room prevents farther observations in relation to it now, as also the insertion of the "proofs" of pecuniary sacrifices, to which he alludes. The latter we shall give in our next. We had them in type for this number, but have been compelled to omit them. P.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

In an article which appeared some three or four weeks since in relation to the Clinton Liberal Institute, I took occasion to express my conviction, that it will soon be found necessary or thought advisable by the Universalist denomination to establish a Theological Seminary. That remark has called forth from one of my respected associates in the editorial department of the Messenger, a somewhat labored article expressive of his entire dissent from the suggested measure, and from the other, a brief, but very significant protest. As I regard the subject an important one, which cannot be too early discussed, I would beg the indulgence of our readers, while I offer an exposition of my views upon it; and I hope it may tend to allay apprehensions for the well being of our common cause, which my Associates, and with them perhaps a respectable part of the denomination, seem to entertain. I am probably not aware of the dangers with which they think a Theological Seminary fraught. The subject has for some time been among those of my most familiar thoughts, and I should be unwilling to believe that such an institution involves any evils which are not far more than counterbalanced by the great good it would naturally and almost necessarily effect. Nay, I see no evils connected with a Theological Seminary, which are not incidental, and perhaps to a greater extent, to every species of theological instruction.

The whole field of investigation relative to this subject, seems to me to be embraced in the following questions.

First. Are any qualifications, which can be acquired by a study of Theology, so called, necessary to the best performance of ministerial duties? And

Second. If any such qualifications are necessary, what is the best way to acquire them?

To the first of these questions, but one answer, I think, either will, or can, be returned. Some qualifications of the nature here mentioned are not only necessary, but indispensable, not for the *best*, but even for a *tolerable* performance of ministerial duty. This is evident, since one cannot teach others what he does not understand himself. To explain the Holy Scriptures, constitutes an important part of the Christian minister's labor, and requires qualifications, which, without the special guidance and illumination of the Divine Spirit, can be acquired only by study—*close, careful and persevering study*. Justly to interpret the volume of inspiration is no school-boy task, and he grossly deceives himself who imagines slight attainments sufficient for it. Besides, there is no royal road to Theology more than to Geometry. There is a great variety of facts and circumstances, a knowledge of which is indispensably requisite to the just interpretation of the Divine Oracles, and which can be obtained, ultimately from no other source but books. On this point, I feel confident there can be no dispute.

The first question being universally answered in the affirmative, let us proceed to the second, and ask, *What is the best way to acquire those necessary qualifications*—that necessary knowledge? I can conceive of but *three* answers, which, under any circumstances, can be given to this question. These I will here present.

The method that first suggests itself, is that pursued by self taught men. The individual adopts such a course of study, as his own good sense, or accident may direct. He reads such authors as fall in his way, and in such a manner as he sees fit.

Now it is not denied, that a person fond of study, or ambitious to render himself distinguished or useful in the world, may in this manner acquire extensive knowledge on almost any subject. But it need not be observed that while *one* rises to eminence in this way, *nine hundred and ninety-nine* would fail of success, or perhaps almost in the very outset give up the undertaking, discouraged with its many difficulties. Besides, in case of eventual success, the fact should not be overlooked that much *time* and *labor* are necessarily lost. The individual at the commencement of his study is ignorant, not only of the best manner of acquiring knowledge, but also of the best authors, and very probably likewise of the definite objects he should have in view. He has no distinct vision of the field over which he is to pass, and of course little else should be expected than that he will sometimes wander from the most direct and easy path. In every study, and in almost every pursuit, there are *first principles*, which cannot be omitted without serious injury to one's real progress. There is, in fine, a right way to acquire any knowledge which leads most easily and directly to it. It is only by accident, however, that the unassisted student would hit upon it, at least until he had wasted much *time* and *labor* in almost useless efforts. So plain a case is this, that I cannot believe any person

would recommend such a course to a young man contemplating the clerical profession.

The second method which suggests itself is that now commonly pursued. The young man puts himself under the direction of a neighboring clergyman, and prosecutes his studies under his instructions. This at present is altogether advisable, because it presents the best, I may say the only advantages of which our young men can avail themselves. But these advantages are generally speaking meagre enough. In the first place the clergyman in all probability has not leisure to devote as much attention to his pupil as his best progress demands. And, in the second place, if he had, it may be doubtful whether he is familiar himself with the most profitable course of study; and even if he were, how many clergymen are there whose private libraries can furnish all the books to which a student needs access? The truth is, many of our young men now enter the ministry with almost every thing to learn—their habits of study to acquire—their acquaintance with books to form. They generally succeed, it is true; but the question is, do they succeed to the same extent they might have done in the same time with better advantages? Or in other words, have they made the greatest acquisitions possible during the time which they have devoted to study? I know not how it may be, but I do not believe that a single clergyman would affirm his conviction that the present method of Theological study is the most advantageous. It seems to me every one must acknowledge its inadequacy to meet the wants of our denomination.

The last resort is a Theological Seminary. In such an institution we should rationally expect our best men—those best qualified to instruct in all the branches of a Theological education. To this instruction they would devote their time and talents. Consequently they would adopt the best course of study, or the best which circumstances would allow. In such an institution, likewise, we should expect a good Theological Library, embracing all the standard and most valuable works, to which students might have access. Such a Library is a desideratum to our denomination. Every writer needs it, every student needs it. But where shall it be looked for, if not in connexion with a Theological School. Considered in any point of view, I conceive such a Seminary to possess almost incalculable advantages over every other means of instruction. Here young men fitting for the ministry, would enjoy all the opportunities for gaining the necessary acquisitions which the denomination could afford. Here they would find the best instructors—the best course of study—the best library.

As I have before said, I am probably not aware of the dangers with which a Theological Seminary is supposed to be fraught. Whatever they may be, however, I am convinced they are only imaginary. We may oppose and prevent it for a time, but it must eventually be established. It *must*, for it is the only means we have in our power of meeting the constantly increasing demands for well educated ministers of the everlasting gospel. My individual efforts will be unavailing in hastening an institution which would exert such an influence in raising our denomination and diffusing its doctrines. But it is high time it was made a subject of reflection, and when once viewed in its true character and bearings, it must, I feel persuaded, be approved.

As a General Convention of Universalists in the United States has been proposed, and will probably be formed during the present year, it seems to me the control of the Theological Seminary should be submitted to that body. S.

POTTSVILLE, PA.

Br. Moore, of Reading, recently visited this flourishing town. He was the first to proclaim "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God" to the inhabitants. I am truly rejoiced to hear of his success.—May he go on and prosper in the good work.—There is a wide field before him. It needs cultivation. The people are waiting for the dawn of the marvellous light.—"Be faithful." The blessings of thousands will rest upon thee.—Our readers will be pleased with the following extract of Br. Moore's letter. A. C. T.

"I was cordially received by my namesake, A. Y. Moore. His house was my home. He is truly worthy of the Gospel, inasmuch as he fearlessly avowed and defended the doctrine of Universalism, before he knew there was a single Universalist in the town, beside himself.—The Episcopalians of Pottsville manifested toward me a spirit of liberality which is rarely to be met with, outside the pale of our own church. They kindly granted me the use of the basement story of their church. I preached there on Saturday evening to a very numerous and respectable audience. The Gospel had never before been proclaimed in the place—it was attentively listened to and joyfully received by many. The building of a church was strongly talked of next morning.—I preached again (in the same place) on Sunday morning, to a still larger audience. And in the evening I preached in a school house, which was crowded.—The most profound attention was given to the testimony, and the greatest imaginable order prevailed.

A few weeks ago, it was scarcely known that there were three Universalists in Pottsville. Now it is known that there are many. A little exciting cause was all that was needed to induce our friends to take a decided stand. I expect shortly to visit them again. It is probable I shall make arrangements for preaching there every fourth or sixth week. And I verily believe that in the course of a year, a house will be erected in that place for the use of those who believe in God as "the Saviour of all men."—May the great head of the church carry on the good work." * * * * *

Asher Moore.

FAMILIAR CONVERSATIONS.

We have received a new work entitled "Twelve Familiar Conversations, between *Inquirer* and *Universalist*; In which the salvation of all mankind is clearly exhibited and illustrated, and the most important objections, which are now brought against the doctrine, are fairly stated, and fully answered, by a candid appeal to scripture, reason and facts, the whole arranged under distinct heads, rendering the work a guide to inquirers and a help to Universalists. By Russell Streeter." As we have found but little leisure to examine the work we cannot now speak of it as a whole; but judging from a variety of passages in different parts of the volume over which we have glanced the eye we believe it to be both interesting and valuable. The style, as the title of the book indicates, is familiar, which no man in our denomination can render more engaging than Br. Streeter; and the matter so far as we are qualified to judge is good. We were in need of just such a volume, and therefore welcome it with more than ordinary pleasure. Those who are disposed to *inquire*, should have access to works that, by being written expressly for them, are calculated to enlighten and satisfy them. The number of sincere inquirers, is, we are happy to say, almost daily increasing. The time is drawing nigh when good men will be disposed to "come and see" whether any good thing can come out of Nazareth, rather than receive without question the stale calumnies and misrepresentations with which the pulpit and the press have been loaded in relation to Universalism. These popular falsehoods and slanders must loose their power whenever an individual undertakes in earnest to inquire and learn for himself.

We are gratified by seeing in the preface a determination expressed by Br. Streeter to pursue the subject still farther should life and health be spared. The field is a broad one and successive volumes we should think might be produced with great prospect of usefulness.

"Familiar Conversations" may be had at this office. They form a large 18 mo. vol. of 327 pages. Price in cloth 50 cents. S.

We owe the Editor of the Trumpet an apology for so long neglecting to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of "Whitman's Letters to a Universalist," which he had the goodness to send us. That work is in a course of reading and shall be noticed soon. We had intended to have noticed it immediately on its reception, but want of leisure has hitherto prevented. S.

The over-much zealous anonymous gentleman of Farmerville, Va. is informed that he missed his mark. The postage on his double letter was promptly refunded—inasmuch as the deception was obvious. A. C. T.

THE PROPOSED COMMENTARY.

The Maine Convention of Universalists, at their recent session in Montville, passed the following Vote. We trust the measure will meet the hearty encouragement of Universalists individually, as well as collectively. If Br. H. B. 2d can engage in the work, let a prospectus be issued forthwith, and the interest in the measure can be determined at once.

Voted, That this Convention concur with a Resolution of the Universalist Convention of the State of New-York, expressing the wants of a Commentary on the New Testament, more perfect than any now extant, and designating Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, of Roxbury, as the proper person to prepare such a work. The Convention pledges itself to aid the circulation and sale of such a work, should it be published.

BR. L. F. W. ANDREWS,

Of Philadelphia, will supply the Desks in the Orchard-st. and Greenwich Churches the third Sabbath in this month, (to morrow,) in connexion with the senior Editor.

MARRIED,

In this city on the evening of the 9th inst. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. David Griffin and Miss Emily Hunt; and on the evening of the 11th inst. by the same, Mr. John T. Hammond and Miss Jane C. Chollett.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

Br. T. J. Sawyer may be expected to deliver a Lecture in New London, Ct. on Wednesday evening (24th inst,) and at Norwich on Thursday evening following.

Br. Shaler J. Hillyer appoints to preach at Middletown, Ct. on the fourth Sunday in this month, 28th; and in Granby the first Sunday in August.

Latest News from three Worlds, Heaven, Earth, and Hell, as reported at a Four days meeting in Shirley, Mass. in letters to eight Calvinistic Clergymen. By Russell Streeter.—Price 25 cents. Just received and for sale at this office.

TRACTS.

A variety of cheap Pamphlets, suitable for gratuitous distribution, or as exchanges for Orthodox Tracts may at all times be had at this Office.

DEDICATION HYMN.

BY W. I. REESE—EAST-BLOOMFIELD.

Sung at the late Dedication of the Universalist Meeting House in Buffalo.

In soft unceasing strains
Wide wafted o'er the plains,
And round the world in ample numbers, swell
The hymns of greatful praise,
And chants of lofty lays,
From forest, lawn, and mountain, stream and dell.

While life spreads all around,
And peace and joy abound,
Through all the tribe of Nature's vast domain;
The works of God unite,
With reason's piercing light,
To build our hopes on his unerring reign.

* * * *

The volume of His love,
That message from above,
Inscribed on earth, and sky, and rolling sphere,
Unfolds the great design,
And purpose all divine,
"From every face to wipe off every tear."

To give thy children place
Within that ample grace,
Which in its boundless grasp encircles all:
This temple, for Thy praise,
That all may learn thy ways,
We dedicate to Thee, and on Thee call.

Author of truth divine!
Witness our heart's design,
And weigh our motives in Thine equal ways:
Let order fill each mind,
And love to all mankind;
And grateful hearts, in homage towards Thee raise.

Let youth and age conspire
To fan the sacred fire,
Which lights Thine altar and our path illumes:
May constancy and care,
And love, and virtue fair,
Adorn their lives, and rise in rich perfumes!

May each succeeding age,
With order still engage,
And wider spread the Gospel tidings round,
Till every heart shall fear,
Till every ear shall hear,
The life and peace inspiring "joyful sound."

Then in thy courts above,
The residence of Love,
Where joys immortal in fruition rise,
The universal throng,
With praises sweet and strong,
Shall fill Thy temple in the lofty skies.

THE FUNERAL.—A Fragment.

It was on a beautiful day in July, 1832, while the sun was about at his meridian and was pouring his warming rays on the surrounding and fruitful fields, with the greatest intensity the latitude would admit, that my friend entered the room, where I was seated, and announced the demise of Mrs. W——. On the day previous, I had made a call at her house, when I was first apprized of her sickness, which though apparently severe, was not considered dangerous.—Uniformly healthy as she had been previously to the attack of that disease, which had been in progress but four days, surrounded by her family and friends and attended by able and practical physicians, none to whom the knowledge of her indisposition had been extended anticipated ought but her speedy recovery from sickness and return to the family and social circles. But the event belied appearances, and before even her nearest neighbors were informed of her danger, she had said her last fond adieu, to her weeping children and almost distracted husband, and passed that 'bourne, from whence no traveller returns.'

The health officer of the adjacent village of R—— had, on the week previous, reported two or three cases of spasmodic cholera among its inhabitants and certain alarmists had manifested no want of alacrity or zeal in extending these reports to the surrounding country, accompanied with exaggerations, representing this scourge of the world to be doing its deeds of death in that place with fearful malignity and to a frightful extent. Mrs. W—— had evidently died of one of the many fevers common to the country; but it was a day of fearful excitement and unlimit-exaggeration; the attending physicians were not agreed in its technical appellation and, therefore, the ignorant and credulous assumed as an unavoidable consequence, that it was cholera—cholera in its worst, most malignant form.

On the succeding day her funeral was to be attended. Some hours before the set time for its commencement I left home intending to make a call at a friend's, who I expected would bear me company. But I was not gratified with his attendance—his business required his attention.—This was the reason assigned for not attending the funeral of his neighbor. My friend at home had made a similar excuse prior to my departure.

But such pretexts were not satisfactory, and very probably they might attach some credibility to the unfounded rumors in rapid circulation, which induced them to stay at home. And shall fear or interest prevent the performance of what duty and humanity require? Shall the dead be left to bury the dead, and the stricken mourners to stand in utter loneliness at the graves of those they love? Shall we give our undivided attention to business while our friends or neighbors are dejected by sorrow, lest we should not amass sufficient wealth? or shall we turn away from the bed-side of the sick and dying, lest we too should become the recipients of disease and fall beneath the sharp scythe of the destroyer? No! rather let poverty follow us to our graves—rather let that pestilence that has already strode with a deathly step over half the nations of the earth, pass on unchecked in its destructive course, and still encircle the noble and the lovely in its icy embrace; but let friend adhere to friend—let not the hand of kindness be withheld from the sick and suffering, or the balm of sympathy from the bereaved and heart-broken. * * * * *

The appointed hour arrived—the usual rites were attended to—a discourse was delivered to the congregation—the mourners addressed separately—a prayer made—and the benediction given. Then the coffin was borne from the house and placed on a hearse in the open yard. The pall was raised—the lid unclosed—and the weeping friends stood around to gaze for the last time on those features, so familiar and dear to them and which the earth was soon to hide forever from their view.

I saw the bereaved husband as he bent in deepest agony over the lifeless form of her he loved. His face was turned from me but the tremor which shook his manly frame told, eloquently, beyond the power of language, of the deep anguish which rung his inmost soul. And when he spoke, his tone and language were the offspring of despair. 'It does not seem possible—it does not seem possible!' were the words he uttered and repeated with a force of feelling which could not be disregarded by any present, and by me will never be forgotten.

I saw the lovely daughter as she stood beside the bier of her mother. She leant for support, on the arm of him to whom but a few months previous she had vowed eternal affection and whose presence and kindly offices were now required to sustain her in this hour of severe affliction. The writhings of her slight form, as she hung in mute wo over the cold clay of her beloved parent, might sufficiently tell of the intensity of her grief, but when the words 'My mother—oh, my mother!' burst from her lips, the heart that would not respond to the thrill which rent the bosom of that disconsolate one, must be of more than adamantine hardness—it could not be of mortal mould.

The lid was closed—the procession formed—it moved—the coffin was lowered into the ground—the earth placed lightly upon it, and the disconsolate family returned to its home, now deprived of its greatest comfort, its brightest ornament.

Thus perish our fondest hopes—thus end all our anticipations of earthly happiness! The grave, the cold, unrelenting grave is the end of all the living. We turn from it but cannot escape. We approach warily, with caution, but constantly approach. We stand on its brink—we turn to take a retrospect of our lives—we look with sorrow, with regret, on our past misimprovements of time, we would fain recall the past, we endeavor to retrace our steps, but we are too near the receptacle of the dead, our footing gives way, we totter we fall—the clods of the valley cover our dust, a small tribute is paid to our memory, a few tears of sympathy shed, and we are forgotten.—*Rural Repository.*

PROSPECTUS

For the 3d vol. of the Messenger, to be published simultaneously at New-York and Philadelphia, under the title of

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

The proposed change in the manner of publication of the Messenger, induces us thus early to present proposals for the *Third* Volume. No essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it may be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a *world's reconciliation to God.*

Its motto may be, perhaps, the surest index of its character. It breathes neither wrath nor fury to the children of men, but on the contrary, it points to a peaceful messenger on the mountain top, proclaiming "good tidings," and "publishing peace." "*How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.*"

CONDITIONS.

The "*N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist,*" will be published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia, every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at $2 per annum, *in advance,* or $2 50 if not paid within the first six months. The first No. will appear on the first Saturday in Nov. next.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by Carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE,
Publisher and Proprietor

NewYork, June 1833.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,
Nos. 2 and 3 Marble Buildings, Chatham Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.